

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,417	03/26/2004	Michael R. Schramm	11721-043	2648
40879	7590 02/09/2005		EXAMINER	
AUTOLIV			BLANKENSHIP	, GREGORY A
C/O BRINKS	S HOFER GILSON & L	IONE		
P. O. BOX 1	0395		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO,	IL 60610		3612	
			DATE MAIL ED: 02/00/2004	•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	R
\mathcal{V}	Office Action Summers	10/811,417	SCHRAMM ET AL.	(
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
\		Greg Blankenship	3612	
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE M Extensi after St If the pe - If NO pe - Failure Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ons of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. eriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, by received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1) 🗌 R	desponsive to communication(s) filed on			
·	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	action is non-final.		
3)□ S	ince this application is in condition for allowar		secution as to the merits is	
С	losed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i>	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.	
Dispositio	n of Claims			
	laim(s)/-35 is/are pending in the application	n.		
	a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.		
· —	laim(s) is/are allowed.			
	laim(s) <u>1-4,6-9,16-21,23-26,33-35</u> is/are reject			
	laim(s) <u>5,10-15,22 and 27-32</u> is/are objected			
8)∐ C	laim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Application	n Papers			
9)∐ Tł	ne specification is objected to by the Examine	г.		
10)⊠ Tł	ne drawing(s) filed on <u>26 March 2004</u> is/are: a	a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to	by the Examiner.	
Α	pplicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	•
	eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti			
11)∐	ne oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) 🗌 A	cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).	
a) [1	All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received		
	Certified copies of the priority documents.		on No	
	. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			
	application from the International Bureau	•		
* Se	e the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.	
Attachment/-	1			
Attachment(s 1) 🔯 Notice o) of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)	
2) 🔲 Notice o	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te	
	tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) lo(s)/Mail Date 3/26/2004.	5) Notice of Informal Page 1	atent Application (PTO-152)	
		· — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —		

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 7 and 24 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 7, lines 1-2, "at least two of the actuators" should be –the actuator comprises at least two actuator that--;

Claim 24, lines 1-2, "at least two of the actuators" should be –the actuator comprises at least two actuator that--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 16-21, 23-26, 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Eipper et al. (6,224,120).

Eipper et al. disclose a retractable grill (12) attached above the front bumper of a vehicle (23). The grill (12) is moved from a retracted position behind the bumper, Figure 3, to an extended position in front of the bumper (23), Figure 6. Multiple actuators (51-54) cause the movement of the grill when either a speed sensor or an impact sensor (56) detects an impending crash. Elements (42) of the actuator mechanically fail when subjected to a load, including those of claims 17 and 34. Headlight apertures are formed in the grill (12). The grill (12) substantially encompasses the frontal surface of the vehicle's front end. The actuators can be operated either manually or automatically.

Application/Control Number: 10/811,417

Art Unit: 3612

Double Patenting

Page 3

- 4. Applicant is advised that should claim 2 be found allowable, claim 3 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).
- 5. Applicant is advised that should claim 4 be found allowable, claim 19 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).
- 6. Applicant is advised that should claim 20 be found allowable, claim 21 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 5, 10-15, 22, and 27-32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greg Blankenship whose telephone number is (703) 305-0223.

Art Unit: 3612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 746-3511, (for informal or draft communications, please clearly label "FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY", "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

gab (February 7, 2005

GHEGORY BLANKENSHIP PATENT EXAMINED